

DAC DAC

#### **PATENT**

#### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

## In re Application of:

Dionne et al.

Serial No.: 10/814,801

**Filed:** March 31, 2004

For: OSMOTIC PUMP WITH MEANS

FOR DISSIPATING INTERNAL

PRESSURE

Confirmation No.: 4974

Examiner: Unknown

**Group Art Unit: 3763** 

Attorney Docket No.: 3139-6349.1US

(ALZ5018/2697)

NOTICE OF EXPRESS MAILING

Express Mail Mailing Label Number: EL994823586US

Date of Deposit with USPS: March 7, 2005

Person making Deposit: Steve Wong

# REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Request for Reconsideration of the Decision Refusing Status under 37 CFR 1.47(a) having a mailing date of January 6, 2005 denying a Petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) to Suspend or Waive the Rules accompanying the Response to Notice to File Missing Parts of NonProvisional Application dated December 14, 2004 for the above-identified application.

The Decision indicates that "petitioners have not provided sufficient proof that a copy of the application (specification, including claims, drawings, if any, and the declaration) was sent to the non-signing inventor. . . . Thus, there is no evidence to show that Mr. Mosbauer had the

benefit of reviewing the application." On March 1, 2005, Mr. Mosbauer was sent a letter (both electronically and via Federal Express) which included a copy of the as-filed application with claims, as-filed drawings, declaration and assignment. Neither a response nor a Declaration has been received from Mr. Mosbauer. The facts of the contact are set forth in the SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF DEBRA L. MITCHELL REGARDING EFFORTS TO REACH INVENTOR ROBERT MOSBAUER enclosed herewith.

In summary, while numerous attempts were made to contact the inventor, Robert Mosbauer, and copies of the as-filed application with claims, drawings and Declaration were sent to him, no response has been received. It is evident from Mr. Mosbauer's conduct that, for some unknown reason, he will not execute the Declaration.

Accordingly, Applicants herein respectfully request reconsideration of the petition to suspend or waive the rules pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.47(a), and specifically for a waiver of the requirement for a Declaration executed by inventor Robert Mosbauer, as it is apparent that he has de facto refused to execute and return to Applicants' attorney the Declaration received by him.

Applicants understand that no additional fees are required. However, if the Office determines that any comparison fees or other additional fees are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fees to TraskBritt Deposit Account No. 20-1469. A copy of this Transmittal Letter is enclosed for deposit account charging purposes.

### Serial No. 10/814,801

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration of the Decision Refusing Status under 37 CFR 1.49(a) and further prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Edgar R. Cataxinos Registration No. 39,931 Attorney for Applicants

TRASKBRITT P.O. Box 2550

Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550

Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: March 7, 2005

ERC/dlm:dn

Enclosures: Copy of Request for Reconsideration

Copy of Decision Refusing Status Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)

Supplemental Declaration of Debra L. Mitchell Regarding Efforts to Reach

Inventor Robert Mosbauer with attached Exhibits A-F

Document in ProLaw

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

JAN 12 2005

P.O. BOX 2550 TRASKBRITT PO SALT LAKE CITY UT 84110

COPY MAILED

JAN 0 6 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of Keith E. Dionne et al.

TRASK BRITT

Application No. 10/814,801

Filed: March 31, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 3139-6349.1US

**DECISION REFUSING STATUS** 

UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)

This decision is in response to the petition filed December 14, 2004, under 37 CFR 1.47(a), in response to the Notice to File Missing Parts "Notice" mailed June 14, 2004.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Rule 47 applicant is given TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this decision to respond, correcting the below-noted deficiencies. Any response should be entitled "Request for Reconsideration of Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)" and may include an oath or declaration executed by the inventor. Failure to respond will result in abandonment of the application. Any extensions of time will be governed by 37 CFR 1.136(a).

The above-identified application was filed on March 31, 2004, naming Keith E. Dionne, Robert Mosbauer, Craig R. Davis and John R. Peery, but without a signed declaration. Accordingly, on June 14, 2004, a "Notice To File Missing Parts of Application" was mailed, requiring inter alia a properly executed oath or declaration.

In response, the present petition was filed with a request for a four month extension of time and the oath and declaration signed by inventors Dionne, Davis and Peery only. Petitioners seek status under 37 CFR 1.47(a) based on the fact that correspondences have been sent by mail and email as well as phone calls/messages, but that in spite of those efforts to have the oath or declaration executed, Mr. Mosbauer has not complied with the requests.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) requires:

- (1) proof that the non-signing inventor cannot be reached or refuses to sign the oath or declaration after having been presented with the application papers (specification, claims and drawings);
- (2) an acceptable oath or declaration in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 115 and 116:
  - (3) the petition fee; and
  - (4) a statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventor.

The present petition lacks item (1).

In regards to item (1), petitioners have not provided sufficient proof that a copy of the application (specification, including claims, drawings, if any, and the declaration) was sent to the non-signing inventor. The "Declaration by Debra Mitchell regarding efforts to reach Robert Mosbauer", reveal that the declaration was sent to Mr. Mosbauer electronically and via FedEx, but don't indicate that the complete application was ever sent to Mr. Mosbauer. Thus, there is no evidence to show that Mr. Mosbauer had the benefit of reviewing the application.

Petitioners may show proof that a copy of the application was sent or given to the non-signing inventors for review by providing a copy of the cover letter transmitting the application papers to the non-signing inventors or details given in an affidavit or declaration of facts by a person having first hand knowledge of the details.

Likewise, before a *bona fide* refusal can be shown, the non-signing inventor must have been given an opportunity to review the application. Therefore, petitioners must show proof that the non-signing inventor refuses to sign the declaration after being sent or given a copy of the application papers. If there is a written refusal, petitioners should submit a copy of that refusal with any renewed petition. If the refusal was made orally to a person, then that person must provide details of the refusal in an affidavit or declaration of facts.

With respect to the petition fee, please be advised that effective November 22, 2004, the petition fee has been increased to \$200.00. Therein, deposit account no. 20-1469, will be charged in the amount of \$70.00 to make up the difference between that which was paid and that which is due pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(g). See the Notice published in the Federal Register on September 21, 2004 and in the Official Gazette of the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 12, 2004.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Mail Stop Petitions

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX:

(703) 872-9306

Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

Patricia Faison-Ball

**Senior Petitions Attorney** 

Micia taison

Office of Petitions